UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/050,582	01/16/2002	Kurt J. Hausheer	10013859-1	7107

		EXAMINER
7590 11/18/2005		HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 January 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 17 August 2005, Applicant amended Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 16-18 and 28, and argued against all objections and rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 1 June 2005.

The objections to Claims 2-8, 16 and 18 previously set forth are withdrawn. The rejections of Claims 1-9 and 17-31 under 35 U.S.C. 101 previously set forth are withdrawn. The rejections of Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-20, 22-24 and 26-33 under 35 U.S.C. 102 previously set forth are withdrawn. The rejections of Claims 4, 8, 21 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103 previously set forth are withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term "*users*" in Line 7 should be amended to — user's — because the term should be a possessive rather than a plurality.

Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- the term "*predetermines*" in Line 3 should be amended to — predetermined — because it appears to be a typographic error.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-20, 22-24 and 26-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Glezerman, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US

2003/0207237, in view of LeMole et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,009,410.

Claim 1:

Glezerman discloses *a computerized method for collating experiences of an*

interactive user Internet session (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this

limitation in that the interactive entertainment system collects data concerning Internet

use for a user), *comprising the steps of:*

- *archiving a plurality of a user's Internet experiences in correspondence with*

  correlated decisions and outcomes (see the entire publication – Glezerman

  discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system accumulates

  data concerning a user's interactions and movements within a controlled

  environment);

- *arranging the decisions and outcomes in accordance with a predetermined*

  scheme (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that

  the interactive entertainment system controls the environment presented to the

  user through preset parameters).

Glezerman fails to expressly disclose:

- *presenting the user with advertisements relevant to the users Internet experiences.*

LeMole teaches *a computerized method for collating experiences of an interactive user Internet session* (see the entire patent – LeMole teaches this limitation in that the advertising system collects data concerning Internet use for a user), *comprising the steps of:*

- *presenting the user with advertisements relevant to the users Internet experiences* (see the entire patent – LeMole teaches this limitation in that the system presents advertising to the user that is based on websites previously visited by the user),

for the purpose of specifically customizing advertising material to the user's interests.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Glezerman, to include:

- *presenting the user with advertisements relevant to the users Internet experiences,*

for the purpose of specifically customizing advertising material to the user's interests, as taught by LeMole.

Claim 2:

Glezerman discloses the step of *printing a selected portion of a plurality of the user's Internet experiences in accordance with a selected printing option* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system provides reports to a guardian concerning the user's interactions and movements within the controlled environment).

Claim 3:

Glezerman discloses that *the selected portion is one of:*

- *a partial sequence of the user's Internet experiences* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system provides reports to a guardian concerning a portion of the user's interactions and movements within the controlled environment);

- *a sequence of the user's Internet experiences that comprises a logical unit* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system provides lessons to the user); *and*

- *a sequence of the user's Internet experiences that comprises a start-to-finish compilation of a multi-step activity of the user* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system provides activities for the user within the controlled environment).

Claim 5:

Glezerman discloses that *the selected printing option includes, for the start-to-finish compilation, dynamically generating one of a table of contents and an index* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system allows the guardian to set the format of the reports).

Claim 6:

Glezerman discloses that *the selected printing option includes one of :*

- *dynamically generating images to accompany written information for the start-to-finish compilation* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system provides an environment that includes both text and images); *and*

- *dynamically selecting images to accompany written information for the start-to-finish compilation* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system allows a user to select the parameters for the controlled environment and provides an agent to dynamically insert text and images).

Claim 7:

Glezerman discloses that *the selected printing option includes, for the start-to-finish compilation, dynamically generating a listing of related further reading* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive

entertainment system provides expert counsel by a virtual psychologist to the guardian.

This disclosure suggests that the counsel may be provided by "*generating a listing of

related further reading.*").

Claim 9:

Glezerman discloses that *the arranging step further comprises arranging a start-

to-finish compilation in a non-book format* (see the entire publication – Glezerman

discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system may comprise a

variety of media including audio and video).

Claim 10:

Glezerman discloses that *the arranging step further comprises generating an

audio stream* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the

interactive entertainment system may comprise a variety of media including audio).

Claim 11:

Glezerman discloses *a method of providing and managing a pick-a-path

experience for a set of interactive user Internet sessions* (see the entire publication –

Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system provides

a controlled virtual environment for a user)*, comprising the steps of:*

- *archiving user decisions and outcomes of the interactive user Internet sessions*

  (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the

interactive entertainment system accumulates data concerning a user's

interactions and movements within a controlled environment); *and*

- *compiling and publishing the user decisions and outcomes for a selected portion*

   of a complete set of the interactive user Internet sessions (see the entire

   publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive

   entertainment system provides reports to a guardian concerning the user's

   interactions and movements within the controlled environment).

Glezerman fails to expressly disclose:

- *presenting advertisements relevant to the user that are relevant to the interactive*

   user Internet session.

LeMole teaches *a computerized method for managing Internet sessions* (see the

entire patent – LeMole teaches this limitation in that the advertising system collects data

concerning Internet use for a user), *comprising the steps of:*

- *presenting advertisements relevant to the user that are relevant to the interactive*

   user Internet session (see the entire patent – LeMole teaches this limitation in

   that the system presents advertising to the user that is based on websites

   previously visited by the user),

for the purpose of specifically customizing advertising material to the user's interests.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Glezerman, to include:

- *presenting advertisements relevant to the user that are relevant to the interactive user Internet session,*

for the purpose of specifically customizing advertising material to the user's interests, as taught by LeMole.

Claim 12:

Glezerman discloses that *the pick-a-path experience is one of: an educational experience, a simulation, an entertainment experience and a gaming experience* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system provides learning and entertainment software within a virtual learning and playing environment).

Claim 13:

Glezerman discloses that *the pick-a-path experience includes a plurality of activity goals* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system guides the user to learning activities and presents to the user one or more sets of selectable activities).

Claim 14:

Glezerman discloses that *the step of compiling and publishing includes publishing user decisions and outcomes that have been archived for at least one of the activity goals* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system provides reports to a guardian concerning the user's interactions and movements within the controlled environment).

Claim 15:

Glezerman discloses that *the pick-a-path experience incorporates user interactivity and is designed to include content that provides cliff-hanger anticipation to attract users to a hosting website* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system prompts the user to an activity. The interactive entertainment system prompts the user to an activity by offering a prize if the user satisfies a goal.).

Claim 16:

Glezerman discloses that *the set of the interactive user Internet sessions includes incorporating advertising on printed pages in accordance with a predetermined scheme* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system delivers banner ads to the user and includes all banner ads selected by the user in the report).

Claims 17-19, 22, 24, 26-29 and 31:

Claims 17-19, 22, 24, 26-29 and 31 merely recite computer software that performs the methods of Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-12 and 16, respectively. Both Glezerman and LeMole disclose/teach computer software that performs the methods of Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-12 and 16. Thus, Glezerman, in view of LeMole, discloses/teaches every limitation of Claims 17-19, 22, 24, 26-29 and 31, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-12 and 16.

Claim 20:

Glezerman discloses *programming instructions for dynamically altering the start-to-finish compilation to incorporate custom, personalized characters* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system includes a visible "buddy" to guide the user within the controlled environment).

Claim 23:

Glezerman discloses *programming instructions for one of:*

- *dynamically selecting images to accompany the selected portion of the plurality of the user's Internet experience* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system allows a user to select the parameters for the controlled environment and provides an agent to dynamically insert text and images); *and*

• *dynamically generating images to accompany the selected portion of the plurality of the user's Internet experience* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system provides an environment that includes both text and images).

Claim 30:

Glezerman discloses *publishing instructions for publishing user decisions and outcomes that have been archived for at least one educational goal* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system provides learning software within a virtual learning environment and provides reports to a guardian concerning the user's interactions and movements within the controlled environment).

Claim 32:

Glezerman discloses *a memory unit wherein the computer program is stored thereon* (see the entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system provides a virtual learning environment stored on a server).

Claim 33:

Glezerman discloses that *the memory unit is one of: a compact disc, a hard drive of a computer, a floppy disk, and a memory unit of a shared database* (see the

entire publication – Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive

entertainment system provides a virtual learning environment stored on a server).

Claims 4, 8, 21 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Glezerman, in view of LeMole, and further in view of Blumberg et al.,

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0140315.

Claim 4:

As indicated in the above rejection, Glezerman, in view of LeMole,

discloses/teaches every limitation of Claim 3. Glezerman also discloses that *the*

selected printing option includes, for the start-to-finish compilation, dynamically

generating a report (Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive

entertainment system provides reports to a guardian concerning the user's interactions

and movements within the controlled environment, as indicated in the above rejection

for Claim 2).

Glezerman, in view of LeMole, fails to expressly disclose/teach *dynamically*

generating at least one of a front and a back book cover.

Blumberg teaches *dynamically generating at least one of a front and a back book*

cover, for the purpose of allowing a user to interactively finish and view a finished

document (see entire publication).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed/taught in Glezerman, in view of LeMole, to include *a printing option, for the start-to-finish compilation, that includes dynamically generating at least one of a front and a back book cover*, for the purpose of allowing a user to interactively finish and view a finished document, as taught by Blumberg.

Claim 8:

As indicated in the above rejection, Glezerman, in view of LeMole, discloses/teaches every limitation of Claim 3. Glezerman also discloses that *the selected printing option includes, for the start-to-finish compilation, dynamically generating a report* (Glezerman discloses this limitation in that the interactive entertainment system provides reports to a guardian concerning the user's interactions and movements within the controlled environment, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 2).

Glezerman, in view of LeMole, fails to expressly disclose/teach *dynamically generating a preselected book feature.*

Blumberg teaches *dynamically generating a preselected book feature stored in a job description file*, for the purpose of giving a user an alternative to interactively selecting the finishing options for the document (see entire publication).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed/taught in Glezerman, in view of LeMole, to include *a printing option, for the start-to-finish compilation, that includes dynamically generating a preselected book feature*, for the purpose of giving a user an alternative to interactively selecting the finishing options for the document, as taught by Blumberg.

Claims 21 and 25:

Claims 21 and 25 merely recite computer software that performs the methods of Claims 4 and 8, respectively. Glezerman, LeMole and Blumberg disclose/teach computer software that performs the methods of Claims 4 and 8. Thus, Glezerman, in view of LeMole, and further in view of Blumberg discloses/teaches every limitation of Claims 21 and 25, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 4 and 8.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to all claims have been considered but are

moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Doug Hutton whose telephone number is (571) 272-
4137. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:00
PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

WDH
November 15, 2005

DOUG HUTTON
PATENT EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100